

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

15 APPLETON PICKETT,

O R D E R
Civ. No. 09-689-TC

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 MAX WILLIAMS, et al.,

19 Defendants.
20

AIKEN, Chief Judge:

21 Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Findings and
22 Recommendation on August 23, 2011. The matter is now before me
23 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).
24 When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings
25 and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo
26 determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. 28
27 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore
28

1 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.
2 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

3 Plaintiff timely filed objections (doc. 102) and then filed
4 additional objections (doc. 105), both of which were considered
5 by this court. I have given the file of this case a de novo
6 review. In conclusion, I ADOPT the Magistrate's Findings and
7 Recommendation (doc. 98) that plaintiff's motion for summary
8 judgment (doc. 48) is denied, and defendants' cross motion for
9 summary judgment (doc. 72) is granted. This case is dismissed
10 and all pending motions are denied as moot.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated this 12 day of October 2011.

13
14
15
16 

17 Ann Aiken
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28